



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,700	03/08/2004	Chien Hua Chen	021653-001100US	2917
20350	7590	06/30/2004		
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				EXAMINER EVERHART, CARDAD
				ART UNIT 2825 PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PA

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,700	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Caridad M. Everhart	2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,,4,6,7,10,11,12,14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hammer, et al. (US 6,506,306B1).

Hammer discloses operating a CMP process for semiconductor wafers in which the water is selectively discharged such that the water is recycled and used in the facility process(col. 1, lines 17-20; col. 2, lines 20-23 and 45-48; coll 3, lines 9-11; col. 4, lines 60-65). The treatment is free from chemical treatment, in that filtration and osmosis and nanofiltration is used. The particle size is less than the size recited in the claims(col. 3, lines 5-14). The conductivity is in the recited range(col. 4, lines 60-65). There is a valve from which the treated is sent to the process, and there is a plurality of lines(col. 4, lines 26-40; col. 5, lines 20-30; col. 7, lines 1-9). The water is kept in a storage tank after purification (col. 5, lines 20-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2,5,8,9,13,16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammer, et al. as applied to claim 1 above in view of Bowman, et al. (US 6,309,279B1).

Hammer does not disclose a scrubber nor a computer control.

Bowman discloses CMP apparatus which includes a scrubber station(col. 7, lines 47-55) and computer control of the modules and the apparatus(col. 8, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the apparatus and process taught by Hammer with the apparatus and process taught by Bowman because the water purification system taught by Hammer is to be used in conjunction with a CMP system, and because the automated system taught by Bowman is coupled to a source of purified water (col. 12, lines 35-55 which is part of the computer controlled and automated system.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammer et al as applied to claim 1 above in view of Krulik (US 2004/0108277A1).

Hammer is silent with respect to the pH of the water.

Krulik discloses an ultrafiltration system for CMP use(paragraph 0030). The pH of the water at neutral, which is known to be 7, is preferred for the filtration(paragraph 0024).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used neutral pH in the process taught by Hammer in view of the teaching of Kurlik because Hammer uses ultrafiltration, as does Krulik. Although Hammer does not pretreat in the same manner as Krulik, Krulik is relied upon only for the teaching concerning the pH.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caridad M. Everhart whose telephone number is 571-272-1892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. Everhart
CARIDAD EVERHART
PRIMARY EXAMINER

C. Everhart
6-26-2004